rather empty expressions like the following: "The culture industry plays a powerful role in the daily life of the vast majority of individuals in the Western world" [p. x].) This is profoundly not Adorno's point of view. He is less interested in the function of the culture industry in the overall schema of advanced capitalism, and more interested in the form of experience produced within, and upon, individuals by that industry. Again, he is less interested in how that industry produces its products, and more interested in how it produces us as artifacts of it. Adorno's is a critique of the artifact of experience and not the artifacts of the culture industry. Cook writes: "It is unfortunate, however, that Adorno barely touched on the processes involved in cultural production" (p. 48). This sentence can not mean what it says; indeed it seems more likely that the opposite is true, that Adorno "touched" *only* on the processes involved in cultural production.

Though Cook explicitly complains that "too much secondary literature on Adorno has overemphasized aesthetic emancipation—the cracks in modern art which let in the light of critique—at the expense of the speculative emancipation provided by immanent ideology critique" (p. 83), she indicates neither how such an "immanent" critique—via the research projects she proposes—would provide "speculative" emancipation, nor why she deems inappropriate the category of the aesthetic as the locus of just such an immanent ideology critique. (TH)

DEEPWELL, KATY, ed. *New Feminist Art Criticism.* Manchester University Press, 1995, 201 pp., 65 b&w illus., $69.95 cloth, $19.95 paper.

The essays in this volume report rather glumly on the current state of feminist art and criticism in Britain, Canada, and the U.S., which, contrary to the editor's assumption, may not be so easily or comfortably assimilated into one *single* Anglo-American strain. Clearly shaped by the paradigm writings of Parker and Pollock (*Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology,* 1981, and *Framing Feminism: Art and the Women's Movement 1970–1985,* 1987), British feminist concerns overlap with American in identifying women's unique points of view, investigating male-defined criteria of quality, and challenging postmodern conventions of style and medium. Claiming less success in achieving gains for women artists in the past twenty-five years, they consider the state of feminist art criticism to be at an "impasse"; consequently, they worry more about the continuing scarcity of published feminist art criticism and the inevitable effect these trends will have on training future women artists and art historians and on shaping curricula.

These laments stand in stark contrast to two recent documentaries about American feminist art: Broude and Garrard's *The Power of Feminist Art* (reviewed in *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 54 [1996]: 91–92) and *Reclaiming the Body: Feminist Art in America* (a videotape from Michael Blackwood Productions). Although both present honest portrayals of the difficulties of being a woman in the artworld in the past two decades, both are celebratory, the latter boasting a 1990s "bumper crop of women artists." Such optimism is lacking in the British collection, replaced by efforts to convince readers that—contrary to how it might appear—we are *not* living in a postfeminist age.

An array of authors—curators, artists, critics, and women involved in the Women's Art Library—helps us see how women fare in mainstream and alternative gallery venues and how they grapple with representational issues and theoretical concerns, but few essays present sustained arguments of philosophical interest, even in the section that explores the space between theory and practice. Christine Battersby is the only philosopher included. This is particularly ironic given the strong call for interdisciplinary and collegial exchange. There is, in fact, no mention of recent American philosophical publications in aesthetics and feminism.

Also revisited are issues like the overlap of pornography and contemporary representations of gender, textile art as an intersection of high and low art/craft, and French psychoanalytic approaches (sorely neglected in American feminist theorizing of *visual* art). In light of the ongoing resistance to theory, (American) Janet Wolff urges a "non-exclusive, non-forbidding feminist art criticism": a "real collaboration between feminist artist, critic and academic" (p. 18). This raises serious questions for feminists in aesthetics, namely whether we are included in the category "academic" (supposedly we are) and in what capacity. For example, do philosophers really want to work more closely with women artists and critics or do they prefer to remain more interested in metacritical issues and methodologies?

Multiple visions of the future of feminist criticism can create tensions since not all feminists necessarily seek the same goals by the same means. One author desires to break feminist art criticism out of its "ghetto of the converted" which raises the question of whether it "can break through the glass ceiling into the larger world of general art criticism" (p. 21). Others who admit that feminist art criticism has made "only a little dent in the smooth smug surface of the art world" might prefer exclusion from the malestream (p. 22). Again, the contrast with American publishing is worth noting, where it is rumored that some presses already see a glut in the market of feminist scholarship.

As Deepwell states, feminist criticism "remains criticism with a cause" (p. 5). Her call for a vital and

visible "new" feminist criticism is an urgent invitation for all to engage in an ever-expanding dialogue. This volume deserves some attention. As feminism becomes less insular, we will gather more information about women's art in other parts of the world. This can only help to further the cause of gaining more recognition for women's creative efforts while it creates excitement about the new feminist criticism. (PB)

HAMM, CHARLES. *Putting Popular Music in its Place*. Cambridge University Press, 1995, 390 pp., 8 b&w illustrations, $59.95 cloth.

The title of this book of essays nicely captures the odd position of popular music within the discipline of musicology today. That is, while his title, "Putting Popular Music in its Place," sounds like an insult, author Charles Hamm has actually been one of the few musicologists committed to finding a place for popular music among the heavily Eurocentric canons of composers, genres, and style features that have dominated musicology since its beginnings in the eighteenth century. As a doctoral student at Princeton in 1957, Hamm was directed away from the study of American shape-note hymnody to a dissertation on the music of fifteenth-century Franco-Burgundian composer Guillaume Dufay. Nonetheless, or perhaps because of this rerouting, Hamm has spent much of his career posing challenges to the musicological establishment to deal with American and popular music; many of his most eloquent challenges appear in this collection of essays, covering the period 1970 to 1993.

Hamm is reluctant to define popular music in a way that will satisfy philosophers. With tongue somewhat in cheek, he suggests in the recently written opening essay on "Modernist Narratives and Popular Music" that "popular music is all music attacked or ignored in the literature governed by modernist narratives." (By "modernist narratives" he means the influence of the concepts of autonomy, authenticity, and anticommercialism on the cultural debate in this century, leading to the sharp distinctions we make between popular and "high" art.) Thus, our modernist prejudices have taught us to view popular composers like George Gershwin as doing significant work only when their music leaves the dance hall and enters the concert hall—even though a case can easily be made that Gershwin's "popular music" was far more musically and culturally progressive. Hamm's overriding message, made well in this opening essay and also in a scathing review of Albert Goldman's 1981 biography, *Elvis*, is that the modernist distinctions between popular and "high" art have skewed the discourse in music so much that the music of this century that has had the largest audience and social impact—popular music—has gone unexamined by all scholars except those without the musical training to understand what they are doing.

Hamm's other main emphasis is the examination of how and why a popular music culture develops, becomes popular, and travels and fuses with other musical cultures. Several of Hamm's essays are field studies of popular music in South Africa and China, where well-known and volatile political developments in the 1980s had fascinating but largely unknown effects on popular music in those cultures, and vice versa. In South Africa, for instance, Hamm found that strong government subsidy of traditional Black music on Radio Bantu was a deliberate policy intended to encourage separate tribal identities among the Black majority, leaving Blacks unable to unite and successfully challenge the apartheid system; in contrast the influx and influence of American and English rock may have had a more unifying effect on Blacks. Hamm's analysis here is unusual because it goes against the musicological and modernist habit of seeing efforts at preservation of traditional music, folk or art, as benevolent, and outside incursions, usually of popular music, as unfortunate. It is also an indication of how much the careful study of popular music may have to teach us about politics.

The significance of this book to aesthetics is, I think, greater than readily meets the eye. It has been difficult for music philosophers and musicologists to communicate with each other usefully as long as popular music was such a taboo within musicology. So many of the questions that philosophers want to pose about music—what it is and what it does for most people in most settings—could receive no help from musicologists intent on becoming the expert on this or that European Renaissance composer. Unfortunately, music ceases to be seen as an important part of life when the academics charged with its study have nothing of contemporary, widespread relevance to offer on the subject. Hamm's essays on South Africa are literally a mere scratch on the surface of what we could learn about music, society, and ourselves if academics would break from the modernist distinctions of high and low culture and look more critically at what is. Once more, music philosophers have done more than musicologists to take this critical look, but they have made no inroads to speak of on how music is taught in our educational institutions. It is sad to read Hamm's statement in the preface that "in a sense I've been a scholar without a home discipline for the last two decades." If that is so, it is the discipline of musicology that has lost, far more than he. (CD)